

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed May 16, 2005. Through this response, claim 8 is amended to incorporate the features of claims 9 and 11 and to correct for proper antecedent basis, claim 12 is amended to correct for proper claim dependency, claim 15 is amended to incorporate subject matter of claim 17, and claim 19 is amended to place in independent form, incorporating the features of claims 15 and 17. Further, claims 9, 11, and 17 have been canceled with their corresponding subject matter incorporated into their respective independent claim as described above. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims 1-7, 8, 10, 12-16, and 19-21 are respectfully requested.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1-7 are allowed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 11-14 and 17-21 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As indicated above, Applicants have amended claims 8, 15, and 19 to incorporate allowable claim features. In that it is believed that every rejection has been overcome, it is submitted that each of the claims that remains in the case is presently in condition for allowance.

**II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that:

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- (i) the locally generated events (line 8 claim 8). Correction is required.

In response to this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 8 to remove “the” from the phrase “the locally generated events.” In view of the above described amendment to the claim, it is respectfully asserted that claims 8-10 currently define an embodiment of the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn.

### **III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

#### **A. Rejection of Claims 8-10 and 15-16**

Claims 8-10 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Goldszmidt* (“Goldszmidt,” U.S. Pat. No. 6,195,680) in view of *Fernstrom* (“Fernstrom,” U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,827). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting issuance of the current case, Applicants have amended claims 8, 15, and 19 to incorporate allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is rendered moot and request that the rejections to claims 8-10 and 15-16 be withdrawn.


### **IV. Canceled Claims**

As identified above, claims 9, 11 and 17 have been canceled from the application through this Response without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David Rodack  
Registration No. 47,034